))

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 5349 of 2002

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

KAMLESH @ KAMLI DAYARAM SINDHI

Versus

THE STATE OF GUJARAT,

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 5349 of 2002

MR HR PRAJAPATI for Petitioner No. 1

MR MR PRAJAPATI for Petitioner No. 1

MR IM PANDYA, AGP for Respondent No. 1-3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

Date of decision: 22/10/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

The petitioner has been detained under the provisions of Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social

Activities Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as `the Act of 1985') by the order dated 29-5-2002 passed by the Police Commissioner, Ahmedabad City, and he has been declared as bootlegger.

2. It is now well settled that unless the activities of a person as bootlegger has disturbed the maintenance of public order, he cannot be detained under the Act. Reliance is placed on a decision of the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta Vs. Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad & Ors. reported in AIR 1989 SC 491.

3. Heard learned advocate for the petitioner and the learned AGP for the State. An affidavit-in-reply is filed on behalf of the respondent No.2. Also perused the record. Learned advocate for the petitioner has submitted that only one offence has been registered against the detenu at Prohibition East Police Station No.1261/2002 dated 26-5-2002. Drawing my attention towards page 19 of the compilation, Mr.Prajapati has contented that when the order of detention was passed, the detenu was in judicial custody which aspect ought to have been considered by the authority while passing the detention order. In this connection, he has drawn my attention towards the case of Amritlal and Others Vs. Union Govt. Through Secy., Ministry of Finance and Others, 2001 SCC (Cri) 147 wherein it was held at Head note as under:

> "Preventive Detention--Detention order-Subjective satisfaction--Detenu already in jail-Detaining authority must be satisfied on the basis of available cogent material about likelihood of the detenu being released on bail and not merely about likelihood of his moving application for bail--In absence of such satisfaction detention order cannot be sustained--Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic drugs and Psychotropic Substances act, 1988, S.3(1)"

4. It seems that there is non-application of mind on the part of detaining authority as detenu was in judicial custody when the impugned order of detention was passed and hence, in view of the judgment rendered in Amritlal (supra), the continued detention of the detenu is illegal and the same cannot be sustained.

5. The petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 29-5-2002 passed against the detenu is hereby quashed and set aside. The detenu Kamlesh @ Kamli Dayaram Sindhi is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith,

if not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly with no order as to costs. Direct service is permitted.

(R.P.DHOLAKIA,J.)

radhan/